



**Awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content website
users and non-users towards privacy in Malta:
a qualitative study**

Noellie Brockdorff¹, Sandra Appleby-Arnold¹, Bogdan Manolea², Ioana Vasiu³

¹ Department of Cognitive Science, University of Malta, Msida, Malta

² Association for Technology and Internet, Bucharest, Romania

³ Faculty of Law, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

January 2013



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 285582.

CONSENT

Consumer Sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy
(G.A. 244643).

The project was co-financed by the European Union within the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013).
<http://www.consent.law.muni.cz>

The views expressed in this report are the sole responsibility of the authors
and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union

Correspondence about this report should be addressed to
Noellie Brockdorff, Department of Cognitive Science, University of Malta, Msida, MSD2080, Malta
noellie.brockdorff@um.edu.mt

Table of Contents

1. Key Findings	3
2. Introduction	5
2.1. Study Target	5
2.2. Methodology	6
2.3. Description of the Sample	7
3. Results	8
3.1. General Online Attitudes	8
3.2. Information Disclosure – “Offline” and Online	10
3.3. Privacy Matters	13
3.3.1. Which Privacy matters: Awareness and (Non-)Acceptance	13
3.3.2. How Privacy matters: Protective Measures	14
3.3.3. Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies	17
4. Conclusion: About Balance, Boundaries, and Choice	19
 Acknowledgements	 20
 Appendices	 21
A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)	21
A.2 Interview Guidelines (Maltese)	29
B. Pre-Analysis Template	38

1. Key Findings

This document presents the Malta results of a qualitative study undertaken as part of the CONSENT project (work package 8). The analyses and results are based on a set of ten semi-structured in-depth interviews regarding the awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content (UGC) website users towards privacy. The respective interview guideline consisted of 27 questions and sub-questions.

The selection of interviewees was aiming at a 8:2 split between UGC users and non-users, an even gender distribution, and a further split by age group to ensure as wide a representation as possible. However, the data did not reveal any strong links between the respondents' attitudes and their different gender or age, confirming the result from the previous quantitative study (CONSENT work package 7).

Regarding general perceptions of privacy, respondents differentiated between information that is perceived as personal but not very private, information that is perceived as private and its privacy status being a social norm, and information which is considered as private and critical, its disclosure being associated with potential personal risks.

However, in the disclosure of personal and private information on UGC websites, another level of perception was brought into play: whether respondents perceived themselves as information providers, information sharers (with a strong sense of reciprocity), or merely passive information users. Whilst perceptions of providing and sharing information can coincide – and in offline situations they usually do – online they do not necessarily have to. Here, most UGC users revealed attitudes where sharing personal or private information on non-SNS websites was strongly limited and passive usage preferred, whilst in the context of social networking it was perceived as entertaining and often done in a playful manner.

On the other side, being strongly engaged in social networking didn't necessarily go alongside with a greater willingness to disclose information online for commercial trade-off's, and being open to commercial trade-off's was not visibly linked to a more "generous" disclosure of personal and private information on UGC sites.

Regarding the different specific practices of websites owners, respondents mostly accepted the customising of website content – either as the acceptance of "reality", by appreciating the free services such websites provide, or it was accepted due to the belief that a machine was steering this process which, being impersonal, wouldn't represent a privacy invasion. Website owners' passing on personal and private information to others was accepted by the majority of respondents only under the condition that prior consent would be sought, representing the demand for privacy by default instead of publicity by default. Generally, the interviewees considered it as unacceptable that they don't know to whom exactly their personal information was being passed on.

Selling personal and private information to other companies or gathering in-depth information of users was not accepted by the majority of respondents. Although some described their fascination for the technical possibilities in that area, they felt deeply uncomfortable about them, due to the uncertainty and lack of specific knowledge about

their potential uses, affirming their attitude that a willingness to disclose certain personal or private information does not mean that users are accepting to give up control.

As main measures to keep a certain level of control, the majority of respondents used nicknames, set up entire fake identities or, if it was perceived as not possible to maintain sufficient control over one's own privacy, shifted online practices back offline. Additionally, all interviewees showed a strong awareness about the need to adapt privacy settings, being aware that a default setting may (or mostly will) not be in their personal best interest.

The majority of interviewees also claimed that they mostly read privacy policies, although both readers and non-readers stated difficulties in the policies' form and structure. However, most of the policy-reading respondents perceived them explicitly as an important measure to control their privacy, and they considered it being their personal responsibility to actively deal with these policies. Some interviewees expressed expectations of a greater specification of the actual data handling by website providers. This in combination with a clearer separation between privacy-related and general issues, and the inclusion of educational aspects related to privacy may work towards counter-balancing user inertia and increase further the users' trust that privacy policies are, actually, worth reading.

Ultimately, most interviewees were aware that there exists, actually, no "hard" boundary between what is public and what is private online, but when outlining and demanding such, they revealed an attitude which is, perhaps closest to imagining online privacy as a social value. Thus, as avid UGC users, they may be rather favouring and working *towards* privacy rather than giving it up, and they revealed a willingness to take over some of the responsibility for doing so.

2. Introduction

2.1 Study Target

The analyses and results in this document are based on a set of semi-structured in-depth interviews regarding the awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content (UGC) website users towards privacy. This study was undertaken as part of the CONSENT¹ project.

This document highlights the findings from the study that are relevant to Malta. Other separate reports are available for Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

The interview guideline used in this study consisted of 27 questions and sub-questions, covering general internet usage and its perceptions, individual attitudes and behaviour regarding the specific usage of UGC websites, probing in particular those related to the disclosure of personal and private information. Here, the interview design was specifically aiming at gaining an in-depth understanding of individual levels of awareness and (non-) acceptance concerning website owners' practices of using such information for various commercial purposes, the experienced, expected – or unexpected – consequences, and the related strategies of users as well as of non-users.

¹ "Consumer Sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy" (CONSENT; G.A. 244643) – which was co-financed by the European Union under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development of the European Union (SSH-2009-3.2.1. "Changes in Consumption and Consumer Markets").

2.2 Methodology

Overall 130 interviews – ten in each country (see above) – were conducted between May and July 2012. Personal references and snowball techniques were used to find individuals willing to take part in this study which, as a qualitative analysis, does not claim to be representative for an entire EU population or any of the individual EU countries where interviews were conducted.

However, in order to gather a more in-depth insight into the individual perceptions, attitudes and behaviour as revealed in the quantitative study of the CONSENT project's work package 7, the participating partner countries were required to select interviewees following certain quota that would ensure representation of different sub-groups:

Total Number of Interviews = 10			
UGC users		8	4 male / 4 female, of which at least 6 use SNS (at least 1 male and 1 female), and 2 (1 male and 1 female) that use UGC, but not SNS.
UGC non-users		2	1 male / 1 female
of which			
Gender	Male	5	
	Female	5	
Location	Urban/ suburban	8	4 male / 4 female
	Rural	2	1 male / 1 female
Age group	15-24	3	
	25-34	3	of which 1 UGC non-user
	35-44	2	
	45+	2	of which 1 UGC non-user

The breakdown of interviewees' characteristics comprised, as a basic categorisation, the 8:2 split between UGC users and non-users (preferably including two UGC but non-SNS users), and an even gender distribution. Then, the interview requirements were split further down by location and age group, aiming at a wide representation as possible whilst keeping the total number of interviews per CONSENT partner at a manageable level.

After conducting the interviews, all interviews were fully transcribed in the local language, and a pre-analysis template for each interview was filled out in English. The development of this template was based on pilot interviews conducted earlier, and it served primarily for the collating, formal structuring and pre-coding of the vast amount of collected data. Then, the content of each set of country templates was analysed section by section, labelling them with additional codes which either summarised specific processes and practices or constructions and interpretations². This process of re-coding also initialised a critical restructuring and rethinking of the codes applied first, and allowed for a more focussed data analysis and drawing together overarching themes. Finally, a draft version of each country report was submitted to the respective partner for revision and amendments.

² Data could fall into different categories at the same time and were then also double-coded as such.

2.3 Description of the Sample

The data analysis for Malta is based on ten interviews with a demographic distribution which – with the exception of UGC (non-SNS) users not being available and, due to Malta’s specific geography, all respondents being from urban/suburban areas – fully complies with the required quota:

Interviewee No.	Gender	Age	Age category	Location category	UGC usage
I-1	Female	21	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-2	Female	48	45+	Urban/Suburban	UGC non-user
I-3	Male	32	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC non-user
I-4	Female	36	35-44	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-5	Male	49	45+	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-6	Male	16	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-7	Female	35	35-44	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-8	Female	32	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-9	Male	25	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-10	Male	16	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user

Having one older respondent in the age group of 45+ would have been desirable but, overall, there was achieved a comparably even split, and a particularly good representation of teenage users.

Eight interviews were conducted within the university premises (office or meeting room), but for only three interviewees this location represented simultaneously their working space, and one was a university student. Two interviews were held in the interviewees’ private homes – one thereof in a home-office, and the other one in the family lounge. Most respondents were very open, relaxed and keen to respond, two interviewees were also open but intent upon being very precise and accurate in their wording (I-5, UGC user, male, 49; I-8, UGC user, female, 32), and one interviewee appeared to be slightly tense because of her self-perceived “ignorance” towards the internet (I-2, UGC non-user, 48, female), but relaxed later in the course of the interview.

All interviewees (with the exception of I-1 who indicated seven to nine years of usage) have been using the internet for at least approximately ten years; looking at the relation between UGC usage and the age when these respondents started to use the internet, there is no recognisable link between being a “digital native” or a “digital initiate” and using – or not using – UGC websites:

Interviewee No.	Age	Years of Internet usage	Age when starting to use the Internet	UGC usage
I-1	21	7-9	12-14	UGC user
I-2	48	10	38	UGC non-user
I-3	32	16	16	UGC non-user
I-4	36	16	20	UGC user
I-5	49	15	34	UGC user
I-6	16	10-11	5-6	UGC user
I-7	35	14	21	UGC user
I-8	32	15	17	UGC user
I-9	25	10	15	UGC user
I-10	16	8-10	6-8	UGC user

3. Results

3.1 General Online Attitudes

Of those eight interviewees who are UGC users, only three declared that they perceived a certain peer pressure to join into a social networking site (primarily Facebook) – they felt they were *“missing something out”* (I-6, UGC user), or simply started using it *“because other people have it”* (I-7, UGC user). Additionally, the main reason given was to re-establish or maintain contact with (potentially distant) friends, and one respondent described that for him it was particularly the “meaningless” everyday chat in online social networking he appreciated: *“When I am working abroad for a long time it’s a psychological way to feel a little bit at home, just by looking at the even meaningless comments sometimes. It helps me to feel connected – a connection to back home”* (I-5, UGC user).

In addition, particularly the younger respondents described their starting to try out SNS websites as some form of a “maturity process” – *“It was to try something new. I was bored and wanted something new – it was like a growing-up thing”* (I-10, UGC user) – and the playful nature of their initial usage, for example using Facebook in the beginning primarily for tagging each other on pictures. But it was also these younger users who were now using Facebook also as a coordinating tool for many, if not all their different online activities: *“When it comes to books and academic material, there are actually applications that can be connected with your Facebook account or your Google account, so you don’t have to sign up again”* (I-1, UGC user).

Here, the comfort of such connected services appears to overrule the users’ perception that Facebook is, actually, not as “personal” in social exchange as for example micro blogging, but extending its importance for users from a networking to a platform function. Several respondents stated that they *“have more accounts than they can remember”* (I-7, user) but don’t use them anymore due to Facebook’s extending and integrating functionalities.

However, such “formalisation” of social networking may also be perceived as an advantage: One respondent described her negative experience using an (unnamed) SNS website where, after putting up a profile picture, she received offensive sex-related comments, whereas she evaluated Facebook differently: *“Facebook is ok – it’s more open and social”* (I-7, UGC user). In such perception, the publicity of disclosed personal or private information may act as some form of social control, assuring (to a certain degree) that “offline” social norms are also kept in online social networking.

Another, very comprehensive, way of SNS usage was described by one respondent who ran all her business activities through Facebook – a practice which is typical for Malta where many small businesses don’t have their own website but inform about and advertise themselves via Facebook. This interviewee explained how most of her business communication with customers and suppliers, but also part of her private communication was routed through online social networking – however, she also explained that she strictly separates between business and private communication, with different user names and different friends’ networks.

Regarding other UGC websites, most respondents were frequently using photo and video sharing websites, in particular YouTube and Flickr due to their connectivity with other website services, and online forums and review sites to share opinions about their hobbies or technical-professional knowledge. Those respondents who preferred to be “passive” users of such sites, gave as a reason that *“I don’t see why I should open an account just to leave a comment. For me it doesn’t make sense [...] I don’t find it useful to [create an account] just to leave a comment. You are giving extra information for nothing”* (I-4, user). Here, the (otherwise active SNS user) was not accepting that, if already contributing to a website’s content, she should additionally disclose any further personal information. She was deeply suspicious of any extensive personal information disclosure in connection with “just opening” any online accounts: *“My mother plays Farmville, and she really put me off when she started telling me how much information she had to give to start playing – it was a lot to register”* (I-4, UGC user).

Three users stated that they were holding accounts with business networking sites – either due to their general interest in job offers, or, as one respondent (self-employed) explained, as his main source of contracting business. Other UGC services, in particular micro-blogging and multiplayer online games, were perceived by some users as an additional form of “specialised” social networking.

Generally, all UGC users described a very frequent and daily usage of UGC websites, but not as affecting their lifestyle. Those respondents who stated that they were constantly logged in (at Facebook), explained at the same time that this didn’t affect or limit their mobility as they used their mobile phone extensively for SNS services.

Those respondents who didn’t use any UGC websites, gave as reasons that they were either *“a few steps behind the rest of the computer world”* (I-2, UGC non-user) and describing a certain inertia to learn *“these new things”* (I-2, UGC non-user), but they also referred to a perceived boundary between social contacts online and offline, designated as a *“balance of privacy”* (I-2, UGC non-user) – they preferred to disclose personal or private information only in personal “life” contacts: *“I am happy today – I am sad today. Why should I be posting this? It’s completely unnatural and unnecessary, and I don’t like it”* (I-3, UGC non-user). The latter UGC non-user, being otherwise quite computer-literate, held the opinion that many people using Facebook would not be quite aware how wide their disclosed information could actually spread – and that information disclosed online could also migrate offline, pointing at concerns where online disclosure increases the risk of uncontrollable information sharing on a more general level.

3.2 Information Disclosure – “Offline” and Online

In “offline” situations³, the majority of interviewees gave very similar answers regarding whether or not they would disclose certain personal or private information⁴ to a stranger. Being asked for their marital status was mostly considered to be a “common” question, and as giving away a piece of information that is somewhat public and could not be easily abused. Although some interviewees explained that such question may “slow down” the conversation, the fact itself that the stranger could be counter-asked or asked for the reasons behind supported the acceptance of such question.

On the contrary, information about income and the ID card number would generally not be revealed – although for substantially different reasons: Being asked by a stranger for one’s salary was considered as too personal, impolite and a question that violates social norms, whereas being asked for one’s ID card number – described as “*personal classified information*” (I-1, UGC user) or “*personal private property*” (I-9, UGC user) – was perceived as intrusive and violating privacy, combined with a deep mistrust and a perceived risk of becoming subject to fraud. Being asked for one’s income, some interviewees considered talking politely around it, or – by using the counter-question – they would make an attempt to clarify that social norms had been violated.

Being asked for their ID card number, some also perceived such question as an invite to give fake information: “*I would gladly invent it [...] and see her trying to get some information with this fake ID card number*” (I-4, UGC user). Here, respondents revealed an attitude where, if social norms are violated the counterpart may not be bound to them anymore, either.

Similarly, all interviewees responded that, in a conversation with friends, they would reveal their marital status, but mostly still not reveal their ID card number. However, they were slightly more willing to respond to the question regarding their income, arguing that – although still being perceived as somewhat “*completely out of place*” (I-2, UGC non-user) – it could become subject to mutual trust and the principle of reciprocity within friendship relations. In general, some interviewees imagined practices which exceeded a mere reaction of either disclosing or not disclosing the information requested, but the “offline” situation allowed them to counter-react, negotiate and (re-)establish perceived social norms and boundaries – not only with friends but also with strangers.

³ Respondents were encouraged to imagine a situation where, whilst travelling on a plane, a stranger would ask them a number of personal questions – whether they would reveal their marital status, their income, and their ID card number. After that, they were requested to talk about their reaction if the same questions were asked by a friend.

⁴ The distinction made here between “personal” and “private” is following educational definitions where personal information cannot be used to identify someone (in the sense of identity theft), whereas private information can be used to identify someone and may be unsafe to share. This distinction is currently not being made in data protection law which only refers to “personal” data/information, in common language both terms are often used synonymously, within the various scientific disciplines there is a wealth of different definitions, and there are also different meanings in different languages. However, many respondents intuitively differentiated between the two terms – by ascribing to them different levels – or “types” (e.g. ownership vs. spatial relationship) – of privacy.

Whereas the interviewees' responses revealed a comparably homogeneous pattern of answering in offline situations with both strangers and friends, there was a wider variation in answers regarding what information would be disclosed online in the context of online shopping / commercial trade-offs, and even more so on UGC websites.⁵

Generally, for commercial advantages the majority of interviewees were willing to reveal their marital status and their date of birth as well as the number and age of their kids. This type of information was mostly considered as "not important" and "no need to hide". All other information was indicated by the majority of respondents as not to be disclosed; here, privacy as a reason for non-disclosure can be divided into different – though partially overlapping – categories:

- (a) Information was perceived as generally "too private" (in particular one's income and ID card number),
- (b) the disclosure was linked to the perceived risk of fraud (particularly insurances),
- (c) the disclosure was linked to the perceived risk of receiving unwanted commercial offers, (in particular phone number and address), and
- (d) the information requested was considered as "not relevant" for the website owner – something "they don't need to know", and it wasn't understood why they would want such information (for example the annual income).

Overall, it appeared that offline attitudes (towards strangers) and online attitudes (in the situation of commercial trade-off's) were comparably coherent, differentiating between

- (a) information that is perceived as personal but not very private (marital status),
- (b) information that is perceived as private and its privacy status being a social norm (income), and
- (c) information which is considered as private and critical, its disclosure being associated with potential personal risks (ID card number).

Regarding the disclosure of personal and private information on UGC websites, another level of perception comes into play – whether respondents perceived themselves as information *providers*, information *sharers* (with a strong sense of reciprocity), or merely passive information *users*. Whilst perceptions of providing and sharing information can coincide – and in offline situations they usually do – online they do not necessarily have to: Here, most UGC users revealed attitudes where sharing personal or private information on non-SNS websites was strongly limited and passive usage preferred, whilst in the context of social networking it was perceived as entertaining and often done in a playful manner. They were particularly active in the sharing of (own and family) photos and videos, and willing to disclose their tastes and opinions.

At the same time, the most coherent attitude amongst UGC users and non-users was represented by the non-disclosure of their home address, as a measure of protecting privacy, and medical formation which was considered as an especially sensitive area where

⁵ For commercial trade-off's, interviewees were asked whether they would disclose their phone number, address, date of birth, marital status, income, number and age of kids, their spouse's email address, their home insurance, life insurance, and their ID card number.

confidentiality was expected: *"There is no trust – there is no privacy. It's business in the end of the day, so if you are interested in a disease you end up seeing pop-up's of medicines"* (I-7, UGC user).

Finally, being strongly engaged in UGC usage didn't necessarily go alongside with a greater willingness to disclose information for commercial trade-off's, and being open to commercial trade-off's was not visibly linked to a more "generous" disclosure of personal and private information on UGC sites. As such, the interviewed UGC non-users, whilst treating UGC websites and their users similarly to treating offline strangers, still revealed a certain willingness to give away information they considered as "not important" and comparable to offline situations – even including their ID card number: *"They might use it for commercial purposes, but if I'm going to gain something out of it giving information like my ID card – quite a few times you end up doing it [anyway], for example when you buy a car. So, why not"* (I-3, UGC non-user).

3.3 Privacy Matters

3.3.1 Which Privacy matters: Awareness and (Non-)Acceptance

Only two respondents indicated that they were aware before opening a UGC website account that website owners may use personal information provided by users to customise their site's content: *"They tell you and it's obvious"* (I-7, UGC user). On the other side, only one respondent was not aware at all of this website owners' practice – he made no specific link between noticing adverts and his information given but just used to close all adverts and pop-up's as *"I know they are all junk"* (I-10, UGC user). Most respondents, however, learnt about this practice with time after opening an account, primarily by noticing the appearance of advertising becoming increasingly targeted and, simultaneously, more and more information being asked for and more tools being given to divulge such information.

Another way of becoming aware was described by one interviewee as noticing the changes in privacy policies and privacy settings themselves: *"Just by looking, and looking into the settings – seeing, just seeing what settings are available and doing what I want [them] to do"* (I-5, UGC user). In his opinion, it was not enough to read privacy policies once, but it may also be necessary to re-visit these policies and settings on a frequent basis. Finally, media attention was indicated as an additional reason for increased awareness.

Acceptance levels – and the underlying motivation for acceptance – differed depending on the respective website owners' practice. The customising of content was mostly accepted – either as the acceptance of *"reality"* (I-7, UGC user), or it was considered acceptable by appreciating the free service such websites provide: *"I don't mind as long as it stays in a contained space. It is not ideal, but the benefits of using Facebook outweigh the small advert on the side"* (I-6, UGC user). One respondent found it acceptable because he believed that not a person but a machine was steering this process: *"I don't mind because I know this is done by a computer – there is not someone reading my mails"* (I-10, UGC user).

However, although accepting the customising of content and receiving adverts to a certain level – *"as long as there is a balance being found"* (I-1, UGC user) – most respondents did feel somewhat uncomfortable with it:

"It's quite weird, actually. I noticed when you told someone something on Facebook – for example that I got a new laptop or a new bike – you start seeing adverts for new bikes, laptops, on the side. And I think: 'Whom are they giving this information to, and how are they finding it?'" (I-6, UGC user).

Thus, it is not so much the fact itself of becoming the target of customised website content and advertising, but an awareness that this practice is linked to an uncontrollable sharing of information. Additionally, one respondent felt uncomfortable due to imagining an inverse situation: being not only judged – by man or machine – based on the personal and private information he discloses, but also judged by others (who may see what adverts he receives) based on exactly this customised content. The direct function between what information he accesses and what website providers assume he would like to see interferes with his own identity construction – towards himself as well as in relation to others – and affecting his private sphere.

Attitudes and perceptions appear to change when personal information is being passed on without their owner's permission: Only one interviewee found such practice acceptable as *"something we can't escape from"* (I-1, UGC user), but all others considered it either as acceptable only under the condition of being asked for permission, representing the demand for privacy by default instead of publicity by default (4 respondents), or not acceptable at all (5 respondents): *"If I give information for a certain thing people should have respect to sort of limit it to that"* (I-2, UGC non-user). Here, the word "respect" points towards an attitude where adhering to general social norms is also expected in online relationships. However, the trust that a website provider meets this expectation may be assigned to a specific site the user is holding an account with, but trusting one website doesn't mean trusting all of them, as not all websites are equally secure. Generally, the interviewees considered it as unacceptable that they don't know exactly to whom their personal information was being passed on.

Similarly, being sent unwanted newsletters or emails was considered by most respondents as either only acceptable if being asked for permission, or not acceptable for the same reasons as mentioned above. Only one respondent felt not really concerned – *"I just put their mails on spam and never see them again"* (I-10, UGC user) – and rather secure, perceiving mailing lists as containing "safe" anonymised data:

"When you give them information they just put it in a database, and when they send emails they just send it to the whole list. That's all. [...] But if it's with Facebook I would be more careful what I put in: It's not about the data – it is that someone is seeing what I'm doing [...], if you check in somewhere they can see where I am" (I-10, UGC user).

This teenage respondent, although he appeared generally rather "light-hearted" in some of his attitudes and perceptions, differentiated here unknowingly between personal and private information: Whilst feeling a (deceptive) security of personal information being stored in anonymised databases, he clearly defined private information as something that makes him identifiable and to be localised – the security of the latter troubling him clearly.

Finally, selling personal and private information to other companies or gathering in-depth information of users was not accepted by the majority of respondents (with the exception of one UGC non-user who considered it part of the commercial trade-off for free online services). Although some interviewees described their fascination for the technical possibilities in this area, they felt deeply uncomfortable about them, due to the uncertainty and lack of specific knowledge about their potential uses, affirming their attitude that a willingness to disclose certain personal or private information does not mean that users are accepting to give up control.

3.3.2 How Privacy matters: Protective Measures

Privacy concerns of the interviewed UGC non-users were specifically related to a potential misuse of published pictures, in particular of children, and fraudulent abuse of geo-localisation. UGC users' main concerns primarily circulated around one topic: the aforementioned perceived uncertainty about who has access to personal and private

information online. The problem, here, arises on various levels: Users don't know which of their information is actually being used (and how, how long, and for what purposes), but – even if users could (or partially can) tag their “actively” disclosed personal or private data with specific instructions – unintentionally left data traces , as e.g. the social media researcher Danah Boyd⁶ points out, currently don't hold the information for website owners whether these users want to have their information public or private.

In order to “disconnect” – rather than protect – the intentionally or unintentionally revealed information from potential personal consequences, a method chosen by the majority (six) of UGC users was not to reveal their real name on UGC websites but using nicknames. Some respondents considered the use of nicknames as a form of “pro-active” privacy protection, setting up separate accounts with different email addresses, fake names and, partially, entire fake identities to “*check them out*” (I-6, UGC user), for example in case of friendship requests that appear suspicious, but also to register with websites which appear to be not fully trustworthy. Others used nicknames to separate their “public” and their “private” activities online. However, another motivation indicated was the importance itself ascribed to real names. As one respondent explained, to her the use of nicknames was less for protection than, for example on blogging sites, to use a creative name for a creative content. In her opinion, real names were only important in real social relationships.

The main strategy of the respondents to protect their privacy was to be “careful” and disclose “*nothing too personal*” (I-6, UGC user). “*I have shared a little bit about what I like to eat and drink, what films I like, what kind of music I like. Nothing too personal, you know [...] just skimming the surface*” (I-4, UGC user). Already in the registration process for opening an account, a similar approach was described: If there was too much information requested, the site would be left and users looked for a similar site where less information or no formal registration was required. On SNS sites, also the content of online conversations could be affected: “*It makes me cautious what I talk about on Facebook. If I want to talk about something more personal I just call or send a SMS*” (I-6, UGC user). Thus, if it was perceived as not possible to maintain control over one's own privacy respondents shifted online practices back offline. Additionally, in order to not only protect oneself but also the privacy of others, for example family members, the mentioning of real names was avoided when talking about them.⁷

Another possible strategy to deal with the aforementioned uncertainty is to adapt the privacy settings of UGC websites – if such option is available (and known of). Here, five out of eight interviewed UGC users declared that they limited access to their profile to ‘only friends’ – one of them additionally changing his settings on a frequent basis, often for blocking specific people from viewing his information. Two were not sure whether they had chosen the setting ‘only friends’ or ‘friends but not friends of friends’; only one was certain to have limited access to ‘friends but not friends of friends’. Some differentiated between what information was available for whom, for example making one's name and a profile picture available to the public, but everything else visible only for friends.

⁶ Boyd, Danah (2010) Making Sense of Privacy and Publicity, SXSW, Austin, Texas, March 13, <http://www.danah.org/papers/talks/2010/SXSW2010.html>, accessed 07/2012.

⁷ One mother, for example, clearly stated that when writing about her daughter (which she did frequently) she never used her real name but, intentionally, always called her “my precious”.

All interviewees showed a strong awareness about the need to adapt privacy settings: *"I like to think of it, in a way, like [of] your bedroom – who do you want to look in?"* (I-6, UGC user). But such awareness was often not there from the beginning – the respondents described their feelings of discomfort as developing with time and experience, combined with the vaguely uncomfortable feeling of uncertainty about who was actually accessing the disclosed information: *"At first it's fun. [...] But I changed my privacy settings after a year. Because then I felt everyone is checking on you, your photos, what you are doing"* (I-8, UGC user). Another respondent described how, at first, privacy settings didn't interest him but, later, started hearing a lot from others, read comments on Facebook and forums about privacy, and decided then to change them.

Apart from this vague feeling of discomfort, most respondents, however, stated that they hadn't yet experienced any negative consequences from their information disclosure: *"I'm always spending a lot of time thinking whether I should upload this or whether I shouldn't. So I have never regretted anything. I have never deleted anything from Facebook that I was sorry I uploaded"* (I-4, UGC user). Some actually revealed a very strong belief that they could control the access to their personal and private data:

"I don't think people related to my work can get to know my opinions, because I put these people on limited access, as I don't like mixing my work life with my private life. Unless I miss some privacy setting which I don't know about, work people cannot get to know about my beliefs [...] I always read privacy settings, and when these change I read them and see what changed, because if I don't they may get reset to default. I read them so that I make sure there is everything as I want it to be. When I hear that things have changed I go in and change it there and then – wherever I may be" (I-9, UGC user).

Here, the interviewee is not only claiming to be able to maintain control but, at the same time, he is also aware that such control requires a meticulous following-up of privacy settings, and he was very aware that a default setting may (or mostly will) not be in his personal best interest.

Regrets were primarily related to the disclosure of photos, describing an increasing feeling of being exposed and, as a consequence, removing the respective pictures. But taking pictures off again may not solve the problem, as one respondent experienced – *"I had some photos [of myself] with friends that I took off, but they had made a copy – so they are still there. It's quite annoying"* (I-10, UGC user) – becoming aware that once information has been published it cannot easily be "taken back" – reversing public data into private data can prove practically impossible. The feeling of finding one's picture and not knowing how it got there and who put it there was imagined as being very uncomfortable, and interviewed parents particularly outlined the perceived risk of abuse of children's pictures. Generally, the majority of respondents revealed a strong perception that pictures are the form of disclosed private information most likely to be – intentionally or unintentionally – misused.

An awareness of unexpected consequences, however, appeared to be considerably weaker with written comments – for example personal opinions – published online: *"Some comments I wrote I regretted, because I did it without thinking. I just remove the comment if I don't like it. Comments, once they are deleted, they are deleted"* (I-10, UGC). Similarly,

another respondent considered his writing of private comments (referring to his critical religious opinions) as not being public statements and, thus, didn't the risk of potential harm to him. Curiously, here, although being strongly aware of the – potentially irreversible – publicity of pictures, respondents didn't show an awareness that *any* published personal or private information cannot be easily deleted from the public sphere and may take up a life of its own, online as well as offline.⁸

3.3.3 Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies

Six out of the eight interviewed UGC users claimed that they mostly read privacy policies, both UGC non-users and two UGC users stated that they don't. The reasons given for not reading can, generally, be divided into two categories: On a "technical" level, the (non-reading) interviewees indicated that privacy policies are too long and illegible due to being written in very small letters – *"As soon as I see too many small prints [...] I leave it alone usually"* (I-2, UGC non-user) – a perception which they share also with some of those who *do* read them.

On the level of actual policy content, UGC non-users additionally claimed that there was no need for them to read, because they don't *"draw much out of it [...] I don't commit to anything really, so I don't need to bother"* (I-2, UGC non-user), and reading them wouldn't make much of a difference, because neither providers nor regulators could be fully trusted. The non-reading UGC users revealed also a certain belief that privacy policies were all following a certain – albeit low – general standard – *"it's always the same"* (I-4, UGC user) – or that "known sites" and "big companies" would have reasonable privacy policies anyway.

Thus, if both readers *and* non-readers perceive difficulties in form and structure, the actual motivation for making an effort to read may be rather the interviewees' evaluation of privacy policies – to what extent it was believed that privacy policies actually have an impact and can be effective in the protection of personal data and, additionally, to what extent it was believed that website owners actually adhere to their own policies: *"At the end of the day it's not what they write but what they do"* (I-5, UGC user).

Those respondents who do read privacy policies, strongly linked their reading to the reading of privacy settings: *"I skim through the privacy policy, and then I go into the privacy settings and change [them]"* (I-1, UGC user). They also revealed a critical awareness that privacy policies may change, possibly without clearly notifying the users, which requires frequent checking. Most of the policy-reading interviewees perceived reading them explicitly as a measure to control their privacy, and a form of self-responsibility:

⁸ A prominent example, here, may be the case of the 'Ode to Coalinga', where an undergraduate student in the US published on MySpace an essay with derogatory comments about her hometown Coalinga. Although she took it down after 6 days, in the meantime it had been published by a local newspaper, the community response was severe, her family received death threats and was forced to move out of Coalinga, and her father had to close his 20-year-old family business due to severe losses. A privacy invasion claim was rejected by the Court, arguing that posting something on an open-to-the-public webpage – even if only briefly – cannot be taken back as private (source: http://blog.ericgoldman.org/archives/2009/04/republishing_my.htm, accessed 08/2012).

“It’s the user’s responsibility to read them – once you click that you’ve agreed it’s your fault. They are there and they should be read in detail. Whoever is doing them is doing them for the client – to read and to accept and agree. [...] They are readable- so if you really want to read them you can read them” (I-8, UGC user).

“I read all privacy policies, and where I do not understand I look things up in forums to see what I have to do” (I-9, UGC user).

Reading or non-reading may also depend on to what extent there is a belief that certain protective measures can actually be found. Most readers stated that they particularly search for the possibility of changing privacy settings – and the specific treatment of their personal and private data: *“which other parties the disclosed information will be shared with, users’ ability to access the stored information, and what happens to the personal data if an account is deleted”* (I-1, UGC user). Here, respondents revealed a strong interest in several forms of maintaining control – a control over with whom their information was shared, a control over what specific information was potentially passed on to these others, and a control over how long it would be shared.

Apart from being too vague, respondents also stated that they perceived privacy-related content as not outlined and separated clearly enough from general user agreements:

“To find the privacy settings I have to go through all the rubbish like accepting that I am not going to make a nuclear bomb [...] These conditions [sharing or selling information] should be apart and not lost in a never-ending user agreement, because these are privacy settings. I scan through the user agreements, but it’s annoying when these go on forever and you don’t find what you want. Permission to share your data should be in the privacy policy and not in the user agreement – the two are different” (I-9, UGC user).

However, in spite of such critical statements, only one interviewee clearly affirmed that she wouldn’t use a website if she didn’t find the expected clauses.

Finally, one (non-reading) respondent expressed her expectation that privacy policies should also raise attention *“to be careful with whom they [young users] are chatting, that somehow even things that come in are filtered, that not every friend is a friend [...] – that any information you give is on the website, so that you are aware of it”* (I-2, UGC non-user).

Thus, a greater specification requirement of the actual data handling by website providers in combination with a clearer separation between privacy-related and general issues, and the inclusion of educational aspects related to privacy, may work towards counter-balancing user inertia and increase the users’ trust that privacy policies *are*, actually, worth reading.

4. Conclusion: About Balance, Boundaries, and Choice

In the beginning of each interview, the respondents were asked to give their spontaneous associations with a number of terms: honesty, internet, work, family, privacy. The subsequent results show a particularly interesting contrast between the first and the last of them – honesty and privacy. Whereas honesty was mostly described as an established value and a social norm, the respondents' associations with privacy were substantially different: Characterised as being *“recursive”* (I-6, UGC user), online privacy is constantly produced and reproduced, defined and redefined through the internet users' creating profiles, disclosing or retrieving personal and private information, changing privacy settings, and adapting their online activities alongside changing structural conditions and their evolving consciousness. Thus, privacy was depicted as a *practice*, embedded in everyday life.

Rather than being ascribed a normative character, it appeared in these descriptions also as a feeling, something that was *“very important”, “delicate”, “confidential”,* linked to *“security”, “safety”,* and a certain ownership of time and space: It was perceived as *“your own personal space [...] no one should meddle in. It's your own information. You don't want it to be public – it's private. What is not public is private”* (I-1, UGC user). Another respondent associated it with *“boundaries which cannot be crossed”* (I-8, UGC user), which stands in stark contrast with its simultaneously ascribed *“fluid”* character and constant renegotiation. There appears to be a certain tension between these two perceptions or, as other interviewees described it, the need to find a *“balance”* (I-2, UGC non-user) and *“something selective – it's a choice”* (I-4, UGC user).

Now, if privacy is, actually, such an ambivalent and dynamic everyday process related to individual attitudes and feelings rather than a social norm, this doesn't diminish its importance, nor can it be dismissed as being *“no longer a social norm”* (Zuckerberg 2010). If respondents show their concern about online privacy, they do not necessarily claim a right of complete *“secrecy”,* but they do claim the right to have a *choice* – to individually define and control who should be included in and who should be excluded from their private sphere. Sharing personal information does not necessarily violate one's privacy, but not being able to keep control does. If users expect having this choice to decide *“what you want to remain private”* (I-4, UGC user), they also expect privacy – not publicity – to be the default setting.

Most interviewees were aware that there exists, actually, no *“hard”* boundary between what is public and what is private online, but when outlining and demanding such, they reveal an attitude which is, perhaps closest to imagining online privacy as a social value. Thus, as avid UGC users, they may be rather favouring and working *towards* privacy rather than giving it up, and they revealed a willingness to take over some of the responsibility for doing so.

Acknowledgements

This research was carried out as part of CONSENT (Consumer sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy) a project that was funded by the European Union under the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013), Grant Agreement Number 244643.

Appendices

A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)

Instructions for Interviewers

As the intention of these interviews is to gain a deeper understanding of personal opinions, thoughts, feelings, experiences and behaviour towards privacy based on the quantitative results from WP7, it is crucial to allow the respondents to speak as freely as possible and allow them to develop their own chain of thought, rather than following a pre-defined yes/no or “multiple choice” pattern. Obviously, one of the main challenges for any interviewer conducting standardised open-ended interviews is to find the balance between allowing such openness *and* maintaining control – taking oneself back without losing the “red line” – and the wording of the interview questions is accounting for this.

However, conducting interviews about a complex subject will always remain a complex task, and the following practical recommendations are meant to help reducing at least some of the complexities involved.

Plan ahead: Make a definite appointment with the respondent in a location of her/his choice where she/he feels at ease, but keep in mind that it should be sufficiently private to allow for an interview without undue distractions or interruptions. Avoid tight time schedules, as feelings of pressure may – unwillingly – be passed on to the respondent.

Be familiar with the interview guidelines: Practice the questions beforehand, and read the questions-specific instructions (marked in italic letters) carefully. Stick to the guidelines and don't jump between questions.

Be familiar with the technical equipment: Make a short test recording before each interview to assure that the recording equipment is working fine and batteries are sufficiently charged.

Ask open questions: Particularly when probing an interviewee's response, it is tempting to ask suggestive questions (e.g. “So you think / don't think that...?”). Although not always possible, such yes/no questions should be mostly avoided. Attempt to remain asking open direct questions, and also use other probing techniques like empathy, expectant pauses or mirroring, giving the respondent sufficient time to elaborate.

Stay alert: Whilst it is important to be interactive, the interviewer's main task is to listen and observe throughout the conversation. It is also recommendable to remain alert and potentially make notes after the interview, as respondents often give crucial information immediately after the recording device is turned off.

Introduction	Briefing
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>[about 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thank you - Your name - Purpose - Confidentiality - Duration - How interview will be conducted - Signature of consent on consent form 	<p>I would like to thank you for taking the time to meet me today. My name is-----and I would like to talk to you about the internet, what you like about it, what you dislike, and how you use it.</p> <p>As was mentioned when we set up this appointment, this interview is being carried out as part of the CONSENT project which is co-funded by the European Union. The CONSENT aims to gather views of internet users from all countries of the EU. If you wish I will give you more information about the CONSENT project at the end of the interview.</p> <p>Your opinion is very valuable for our study and will be taken into consideration when drawing up the final report.</p> <p>The interview should take less than one hour. I will be taping the session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. Although I will be taking some notes during the session, I can't possibly write fast enough to get it all down. Because we're on tape, please be sure to speak up so that we don't miss your comments.</p> <p>All responses will be kept confidential. This means your interview responses will only be shared with research team members and will ensure that any information we include in our report does not identify you as the respondent. Your name will not be connected with the answers in any way.</p> <p>Please read and sign this consent form. Do you have any questions on that?</p> <p>Remember, you don't have to talk about anything you don't want and you may end the interview at any time. Is that OK?</p> <p><i>Running Total: 5 min</i></p>
Objectives	Questions
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Word-association exercise</p> <p>[about 3 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - establish top of 	<p>Q.1 To start off we are going to play a short game/carry out a short exercise: I will read out a word and I would like you to say the first couple of things that come to mind/pops into your head when you hear the word. Let's try an example first: What is the first thing that comes to mind if I say the word "summer"? Anything else?</p> <p><i>Encourage respondents to use short phrases or single words and to</i></p>

mind associations with privacy	<p><i>avoid lengthy descriptions and statements.</i></p> <p><i>Test words: honesty, internet, work, family, privacy</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 8 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Willingness to disclose personal information in various situations. [about 8 min]</p>	<p>Q.1.1 Now let's talk about something a little different. I would like you to imagine you are on a plane and the person next to you, somebody you don't know and who you are unlikely to ever meet again, is a really talkative member of the same sex about your age. He/she starts talking about different things and after 15 minutes he/she asks you whether you were single, married or in a relationship, what would you tell her/him?</p> <p><i>Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.</i></p> <p>Q.1.2 What if he/she asked you about how much you earn What would you do? <i>Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.</i></p> <p>Q.1.3 And what if they would tell you they can use their ID card number to choose lottery numbers to play. He/she asks you what your ID card number is. What would you do?</p> <p><i>Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.</i></p> <p>Q.1.4 Now let's imagine that instead of this talkative fellow passenger, you were asked the same questions by a friend who you meet a few times a year. What would you do?</p> <p><i>Probe about each of: whether you are single, married or in a relationship, how much you earn, ID card number. And in each case whether respondent would say the truth and why/why not</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 16 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Internet experience and attitudes [about 5 min]</p>	<p>Q.2 Let's talk a bit more about the internet now, how long have you been using the internet?</p> <p>Q.3 What do you love most about the internet?</p> <p>Q.4 What do you dislike most about the internet?</p> <p><i>Running Total: 21 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Underlying beliefs & attitudes to commercial/privac</p>	<p>Q.5 Imagine that you are visiting a website of a discount club, for example a site similar to Groupon <or similar, please choose the one most appropriate for your country>. The club offers up to 50% discounts on different consumer products and services (e.g. books, travel, household goods, and fashion items) to its</p>

<p>y trade-off</p> <p>[about 5 min]</p>	<p>members. The site is currently running a promotion and giving a discount up to 75% to all visitors who provide the site with more information than the standard name and email. Which information would you be willing to provide this website to get this up to 75% discount offer?</p> <p><i>Start reading out list: phone number, home address, date of birth, annual income, marital status, number of kids, age of kids, ID or passport number, email address of partner or spouse, life insurance status, home insurance status</i></p> <p><i>For items that respondent is <u>not</u> willing to provide information about to the website probe reason: Q5.i Why not? Or Why wouldn't you give your...</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 26 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Internet usage</p> <p>[about 2 min]</p>	<p>Q.6 Please tell me a little about the internet websites you use in a typical week and what you use them for.</p> <p><i>Probe if Internet activities describe above (including usage of UGC and SNS) have an impact on the respondents' lifestyles, habits and social relationships (just 2 minutes for this question, so do not go into too many details).</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 28 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>UGC usage</p> <p>[about 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish whether UGC user or non-user - Establish whether SNS user - Establish UGC site used most frequently - Provides link to findings from online questionnaire <p><i>Show card A</i></p>	<p>Q.7 This is a list of some websites <show list of UGC sites used in each country for WP7 >. Could you please tell me whether you have accounts with (not just visit) any of them and if you do have an account how often you log in? <Make a note which whether respondent uses Social Networking Site and if not which UGC website respondent uses most></p> <p><i>Show card A:</i></p> <p>A. Social networking website such as Facebook, <Local SNS used in WP7></p> <p>B. Business networking websites such as LinkedIn, Xing.com</p> <p>C. Dating websites such as parship.com</p> <p>D. Websites where you can share photos, videos, etc., such as YouTube, Flickr</p> <p>E. Websites which provide recommendations and reviews (of films, music, books hotels etc), such as last.fm, tripadvisor</p> <p>F. Micro blogging sites such as twitter</p> <p>G. Wiki sites such as Wikipedia, myheritage</p> <p>H. Multiplayer online games such as secondlife.com, World of Warcraft</p>

	<p><i>Probe how much time is spent on social networks and UGC services daily/weekly (if not established already in Q6)</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 33 min</i></p>
<p>RESPONDENTS WHO DO <u>NOT</u> USE OR NO LONGER USE UGC SITES IN Q7</p> <p>Reasons for not using UGC sites [about 3 min]</p>	<p>Q.8 Why don't you have accounts with any of these sites, or why did you cancel or don't use them anymore? Anything else? <i>Probe fully, but make note of first and second reason given.</i></p> <p><i>We are interested in exploring further any reasons that relate to respondents' concerns about:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the consequences of giving information online, - how information about them is used, - whether UGC sites can be trusted, and - any other issue relating to privacy. <p><u><i>If privacy/information use/trust related issues not mentioned as a reason for not using (anymore)UGC sites ask:</i></u></p> <p>Q.9 For what reasons may you be likely to open an account – or not open account - with any of these sites soon? <i>Allow respondents to speak freely, but then gently probe to establish if respondent feels any pressure to open a UGC account;</i></p> <p><u><i>If any privacy/information use/trust related issues mentioned ask:</i></u></p> <p>Q10. You mentioned that one of the reasons (the reason) you don't use UGC sites is <whatever respondent said that relates to privacy/information use>. Can you tell me a bit more about what in particular concerns you? <i>Probe in depth to determine</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. what aspect of UGC sites respondent finds unacceptable, and why; ii. beliefs about how internet sites use information; iii beliefs about what UGC sites are for. <p><i>Running Total: 36 min</i></p>
<p>RESPONDENTS WHO USE UGC SITES IN Q7</p> <p>UGC sites - Motivations & Usage [about 6 min]</p> <p>Establish:</p> <p>- motivations for</p>	<p>Q.11 Why did you start using <Social Networking Site, if used. If respondent does not use Social Networking site, then UGC site in Q7 used most frequently>? Probe to determine key motivations for using site.</p> <p>Q. 12 During all of the time that you've been using these sites, what information about yourself have you put on the site/sites? <i>Allow respondents to take their time and reply in their own words but probe for: name, home address, photos of you, photos of family and friends, audio-video recordings, medical information, hobbies, sports, places where you've been, tastes and opinions, etc</i></p>

UGC use

- willingness to share information
- beliefs & attitudes on different types of information
- motivations for settings of who can view information

Q.13 Who can see your profile and/or your photos?

Probe Why have you set things up in that way?

Q.14 Have you ever regretted posting some information on one of these sites?

If yes: Q.15 Can you tell me a little bit about it...what happened?
Why did you regret the posting?

If respondent does not mention commercial info & negative effects, then also ask 16.1 and 16.2

If no: Q.16 Could you imagine a situation when you might regret it?

Probe to determine whether lack of concern about respondent's own posting is due to:

- i. respondent posting little information, or*
- ii. always thinking carefully before posting, or*
- iii. thinking that it is no problem that everybody has access to information about them*

If NOT i and ii then ask:

16.1 Do you receive commercial info that you think is a result of the personal information that you have posted? If yes, how do you feel about this?

Probe to determine exactly:

- i. if the respondents are aware of consequences of putting information online*
- ii. why some are more acceptable than the others*
- iii. do people accept that receiving commercial info is part of the commercial trade-off for using the service*

16.2 What do you think can happen (for example regarding job selection, reputation) as a result of personal information you have posted?

If Yes- How do you think this will happen?

If No- Why don't you think this is possible?

Probe to determine exactly how the respondents think about other people using their own information posted on UGCs. Use a neutral tone to allow both positive and negative reactions.

Running Total: 42 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

If not previously established up to this point

Usage of

Q.17 Have you yourself ever used an alias or a nickname when giving information online? In what case/s and why? Or, if you

<p>aliases/nicknames [about 2 min]</p> <p>- explore attitudes towards revealing personal information in different situations</p>	<p>haven't, what do you think about it? <i>Probe more in detail.</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 44 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Attitudes towards use of personal information by websites [about 8 min]</p> <p><i>Show card B</i></p>	<p>Q.18 The information users include in their account or profile on a website can be used by the website owners for a number of purposes, such as to customize the content and advertising that users see, to send them emails, to gather in-depth personal information about them etc. Did you know this when you signed up with a website (or UGC/SNS)? What do you think of it?</p> <p><i>Make a note whether respondent was aware of purposes and probe to determine attitude to use of users' information for each of the following:</i> <i>Show card B:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. customize the advertising you see (show you only advertising for things/services that likely to interest you)</i> <i>2. share information (which could be linked to your name) about your behaviour with other parts of the company</i> <i>3. sell information (not linked to your name) about your behaviour to other companies</i> <p><i>For <u>each purpose</u> probe respondent for the reason behind finding the use acceptable/unacceptable.</i></p> <p><i>If not already mentioned, for any purpose respondent finds unacceptable ask:</i></p> <p>Q.19 Under which conditions, if any, would you find it acceptable for users to give information about themselves to be used by a website for < purpose respondent finds unacceptable>? <i>Probe to determine whether respondent would accept a ticket in a sweepstake/lottery, points on website such as Facebook points, a share of profits from the website, money.</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 52 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Attitudes towards & behaviour on privacy policies.</p>	<p>Q20 What do you think about privacy policies of the UGCs/SNS that you are using? Did you read them before you signed up? (choose one as an example, If no to Q 7, then any other website that you use frequently) If yes – what would you look for? If you didn't find what you have looking for, what would you do?</p>

[about 4 min]

Probe to determine:

- *if people really read the privacy policy;*
- *what (presence/absence of some feature? reassurance?) they are looking for when they do read privacy policies; and*
- *what they do if what they are looking for isn't in the policy (carry on using the website anyway? not start/stop using it?)*

Running Total: 56 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

That's all from me, is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank & close

Hand out incentives if used

Inform about the next steps, give more information about CONSENT project if respondent wishes

Thank you very much for your valuable contribution to our project!

Total: 60 min

A.1 Interview Guidelines (Maltese)

Instructions for Interviewers

As the intention of these interviews is to gain a deeper understanding of personal opinions, thoughts, feelings, experiences and behaviour towards privacy based on the quantitative results from WP7, it is crucial to allow the respondents to speak as freely as possible and allow them to develop their own chain of thought, rather than following a pre-defined yes/no or “multiple choice” pattern. Obviously, one of the main challenges for any interviewer conducting standardised open-ended interviews is to find the balance between allowing such openness *and* maintaining control – taking oneself back without losing the “red line” – and the wording of the interview questions is accounting for this.

However, conducting interviews about a complex subject will always remain a complex task, and the following practical recommendations are meant to help reducing at least some of the complexities involved.

Plan ahead: Make a definite appointment with the respondent in a location of her/his choice where she/he feels at ease, but keep in mind that it should be sufficiently private to allow for an interview without undue distractions or interruptions. Avoid tight time schedules, as feelings of pressure may – unwillingly – be passed on to the respondent.

Be familiar with the interview guidelines: Practice the questions beforehand, and read the questions-specific instructions (marked in italic letters) carefully. Stick to the guidelines and don't jump between questions.

Be familiar with the technical equipment: Make a short test recording before each interview to assure that the recording equipment is working fine and batteries are sufficiently charged.

Ask open questions: Particularly when probing an interviewee's response, it is tempting to ask suggestive questions (e.g. “So you think / don't think that...?”). Although not always possible, such yes/no questions should be mostly avoided. Attempt to remain asking open direct questions, and also use other probing techniques like empathy, expectant pauses or mirroring, giving the respondent sufficient time to elaborate.

Stay alert: Whilst it is important to be interactive, the interviewer's main task is to listen and observe throughout the conversation. It is also recommendable to remain alert and potentially make notes after the interview, as respondents often give crucial information immediately after the recording device is turned off.

Introduction	Briefing
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>[about 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thank you - Your name - Purpose - Confidentiality - Duration - How interview will be conducted - Signature of consent on consent form 	<p>Nixtieq niringrazzjak talli sibt il-ħin biex tiltaqa' miegħi illum. Jiena jisimni -----u nixtieq inkellmek dwar l-internet: x'jogħgħbok fl-internet, x'ma jogħgħbokx, u kif tużah.</p> <p>Bħalma għedna meta ffissajna dan l-appuntament, dan l-intervju qed isir bħala parti mill-proġett CONSENT li hu ko-finanzjat mill-Kummissjoni Ewropea. Il-proġett CONSENT għandu l-għan li jiġbor il-fehmiet ta' daww li jużaw l-internet mill-pajjiżi kollha tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Jekk trid, meta nispiċċaw l-intervju, nista' nagħtik aktar tagħrif dwar il-proġett CONSENT.</p> <p>L-opinjoni tiegħek hija siewja ħafna għall-istudju tagħna u se nikkunsidrawha meta nfasslu r-rapport finali.</p> <p>L-intervju għandu jiehu inqas minn siegħa. Se nirrekordja s-sessjoni tagħna għaliex ma rrid nitlef xejn mill-kummenti tiegħek. Għalkemm se nkun qed nikteb xi noti matul din is-sessjoni, mhux se nkun nista' nikteb b'daqshekk heffa li nnizzel kulma tgħidli. Minħabba li se nkunu rrekordjati, nitlobok titkellem b'lehen ċar biżżejjed biex ma nitilfu xejn mill-kummenti tiegħek.</p> <p>It-tweġibiet kollha se jibqgħu kunfidenzjali. Dan ifisser li t-tweġibiet li tagħti f'dan l-intervju se jkunu magħrufa biss mill-membri tat-tim ta' riċerka. Barra minn hekk, se naraw li kull informazzjoni li ndaħħlu fir-rapport tagħna ma tkunx turi li inti kont il-persuna li tajt it-tweġibiet. Ismek mhux se jkun marbut, bl-ebda mod, mat-tweġibiet.</p> <p>Jekk jogħgħbok aqra u ffirmja din il-formola ta' kunsens. Għandek xi mistoqsijiet dwar dan?</p> <p>Ftakar: m'għandekx għalfejn titkellem dwar xi ħaġa li ma tridx titkellem dwarha, u tista' twaqqaf l-intervju fi x'ħin trid. Tajjeb?</p> <p><i>Running Total: 5 min</i></p>
Objectives	Questions
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Word-association exercise</p> <p>[about 3 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - establish top of mind associations with privacy 	<p>Q.1 Biex nibdew, se nilagħbu logħba żgħira / se nagħmlu exercise qasir: se naqralek kelma, u nixtieqek tgħid xi ftit affarijiet li jiġu f'rasek meta tisma' din il-kelma. Ejja nibdew l-ewwel b'eżempju: X'jiġi f'rasek meta ngħid il-kelma "sajf"? Xi ħaġa oħra?</p> <p><i>Encourage respondents to use short phrases or single words and to avoid lengthy descriptions and statements.</i></p> <p><i>Test words: xogħol, familja, privatezza</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 8 min</i></p>

<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Willingness to disclose personal information in various situations. [about 8 min]</p>	<p>Q.1.1 Issa ejja nitkellmu dwar xi haġa ftit differenti. Irridek timmaġina li qiegħed fuq ajruplan. Il-persuna ta' hdejk - xi hadd li ma tafux / tafhiex, u aktarx li mhux se terġa' tiltaqa' miegħu / magħha - hija persuna tal-istess sess tiegħek u tal-istess età, u tpaċpaċ ħafna. Din il-persuna tibda titkellem dwar ħafna affarijiet differenti u wara ħmistax-il minuta tistaqsik jekk intix ġuvni / xebba, miġġewweġ/a jew f'relazzjoni. Inti xi twegibha lil din il-persuna?</p> <p><i>Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.</i></p> <p>Q.1.2 U kieku kellha tistaqsik dwar kemm taqla' paga? – X'tagħmel? <i>Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.</i></p> <p>Q.1.3 U kieku kellhom jgħidulek li jistgħu jużaw in-numru tal-karta tal-identità biex jagħzlu numri għal-lottu? Dik il-persuna tistaqsik għan-numru tal-karta tal-identità. Inti kieku x'tagħmel?</p> <p><i>Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.</i></p> <p>Q.1.4 Issa ejja nimmaġinaw li minflok dak il-passiġġier ipaċpaċ, kien ikun ħabib - li tiltaqa' miegħu ftit drabi fis-sena - li jistaqsik l-istess mistoqsijiet. Inti kieku x'tagħmel?</p> <p><i>Probe about each of: whether you are single, married or in a relationship, how much you earn, ID card number. And in each case whether respondent would say the truth and why/why not</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 16 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Internet experience and attitudes [about 5 min]</p>	<p>Q.2 Issa ejja nitkellmu ftit aktar dwar l-internet. Kemm ilek tuża l-internet?</p> <p>Q.3 X'jogħgħbok l-aktar fl-internet?</p> <p>Q.4 X'idejpek l-aktar fl-internet?</p> <p><i>Running Total: 21 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Underlying beliefs & attitudes to commercial/privacy trade-off</p>	<p>Q.5 Immaġina li qiegħed f'website ta' "discount club" – per eżempju xi sit elettroniku bħal <i>Groupon</i> (jew xi haġa bħalu – <i>agħzel is-sit li l-aktar jgħodd għal pajjiżek</i>). Dan il-klabb joffri sa 50% skont fuq prodotti ta' konsum u servizzi differenti (bħal kotba, safar, prodotti tad-dar, prodotti tal-moda) lill-membri tiegħu. Dalhin, is-sit elettroniku qed jagħmel promozzjoni u qed</p>

<p>[about 5 min]</p>	<p>jagħti skont sa 75% lil dawk kollha li jżuru s-sit u, barra mill-isem u l-e-mail tagħhom, lesti jagħtu aktar informazzjoni. Liema informazzjoni tkun lest li tagħti lil dan is-sit elettroniku biex tikseb l-iskont ta' 75%?</p> <p><i>Start reading out list: In-numru tat-telefon, l-indirizz tad-dar, id-data tat-twelid, id-dhul fis-sena, dettalji dwar l-istat ċivili, numru ta' tfal, l-età tat-tfal, in-numru tal-karta tal-identità jew tal-passaport, l-indirizz elettroniku tas-sieħeb / sieħba tiegħek, ta' żewġek / ta' martek, dettalji dwar sigurtà fuq il-ħajja u dettalji dwar sigurtà fuq id-dar.</i></p> <p><i>For items that respondent is <u>not</u> willing to provide information about to the website probe reason: Q5.i Għaliex le? Jew Għaliex ma tkunx lest li tagħti?</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 26 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Internet usage [about 2 min]</p>	<p>Q.6 Jekk jogħġbok, għidli xi ħaġa dwar is-siti elettronici tal-internet li tuża matul ġimgħa tipika, u għal xiex tużahom.</p> <p><i>Probe if Internet activities describe above (including usage of UGC and SNS) have an impact on the respondents' lifestyles, habits and social relationships (just 2 minutes for this question, so do not go into too many details).</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 28 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>UGC usage [about 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish whether UGC user or non-user - Establish whether SNS user - Establish UGC site used most frequently - Provides link to findings from online questionnaire <p><i>Show card A</i></p>	<p>Q.7 Din lista b'xi siti elettronici. Tista', jekk jogħġbok, tgħidli jekk għandekx accounts ma' xi wħud minnhom (mhux biss tidhol fihom). Jekk għandek account, kemm-il darba tilloggja fihom?</p> <p><i><Make a note which whether respondent uses Social Networking Site and if not which UGC website respondent uses most></i></p> <p><i>Show card A:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Sit elettroniku ta' networking soċjali, bħal Facebook, B. Sit elettroniku ta' networking kummerċjali, jew business, bħal LinkedIn, Xing.com Ċ. Sit elettroniku għal dating, bħal parship.com D. Siti elettronici fejn taqsam ma' ħaddieħor ritratti, videos, eċċ., bħal Youtube, flickr. E. Siti elettronici li jirrikmandaw u jagħmlu riċensjonijiet ta' films, mużika, kotba, lukandi, eċċ., bħal last.fm, tripadvisor F. Siti ta' micro blogging bħal Twitter G. Siti Wiki, bħal Wikipedia, myheritage H. Logħob online b'aktar inn plejer wieħed, bħal secondlife.com, World of Warcraft <p><i>Probe how much time is spent on social networks and UGC services</i></p>

	<p><i>daily/weekly (if not established already in Q6)</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 33 min</i></p>
<p>RESPONDENTS WHO DO <u>NOT</u> USE OR NO LONGER USE UGC SITES IN Q7</p> <p>Reasons for not using UGC sites [about 3 min]</p>	<p>Q.8 Għaliex m'għandekx accounts ma' ebda wieħed minn dawn is-siti – jew, għaliex ikkanċellajthom, jew m'għadekx tużahom? Xi haġa oħra? <i>Probe fully, but make note of first and second reason given.</i></p> <p><i>We are interested in exploring further any reasons that relate to respondents' concerns about:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>the consequences of giving information online,</i> - <i>how information about them is used,</i> - <i>whether UGC sites can be trusted, and</i> - <i>any other issue relating to privacy.</i> <p><i>If privacy/information use/trust related issues not mentioned as a reason for not using (anymore)UGC sites ask:</i></p> <p>Q.9 Għal liema raġuni aktarx dalwaqt tkun lest tiftaħ account – jew ma tiftaħx account – ma' xi wieħed minn dawn is-siti elettronici?<i>Allow respondents to speak freely, but then gently probe to establish if respondent feels any pressure to open a UGC account;</i></p> <p><i>If any privacy/information use/trust related issues mentioned ask:</i></p> <p>Q10. Int għedt li waħda mir-raġunijiet (ir-raġuni) għaliex ma tużax siti UGC hija (dak li qal l-intervistat dwar il-privatezza / l-użu tal-informazzjoni). Tista' tgħidli ftit aktar dwar dak li l-aktar jinkwetak?</p> <p><i>Probe in depth to determine</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>what aspect of UGC sites respondent finds unacceptable, and why;</i> <i>beliefs about how internet sites use information;</i> <i>beliefs about what UGC sites are for.</i> <p><i>Running Total: 36 min</i></p>
<p>RESPONDENTS WHO USE UGC SITES IN Q7</p> <p>UGC sites - Motivations & Usage [about 6 min]</p> <p>Establish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - motivations for UGC use 	<p>Q.11 Għaliex bdejt tuża (sit ta' networking soċjali, jekk jużah. Jekk l-intervistat ma jużax sit ta' networking soċjali, allura s-sit UGC fil-mistoqsija numru 7 li l-aktar tintuża)? <i>Probe to determine key motivations for using site.</i></p> <p>Q. 12 Matul iż-żmien kollu li ilek tuża dawn is-siti elettronici, liema tagħrif dwerek innifsek tajt lis-sit, jew siti? <i>Allow respondents to take their time and reply in their own words but probe for: name, home address, photos of you, photos of family and friends, audio-video recordings, medical information, hobbies, sports, places where you've been, tastes and opinions, etc</i></p>

- willingness to share information
- beliefs & attitudes on different types of information
- motivations for settings of who can view information

Q.13 Min jista' jara l-profile tiegħek u / jew ir-ritratti tiegħek? Għaliex fassalt l-affarijiet b'dan il-mod?

Q.14 Qatt iddispjaċiek li bgħatt informazzjoni f'xi wieħed minn dawn is-siti?

If yes: **Q.15** Tista' tgħidli xi haġa dwarha ... x'għara? Għaliex iddispjaċiek li tajt dik l-informazzjoni?

If respondent does not mention commercial info & negative effects, then also ask 16.1 and 16.2

If no: **Q.16** Tista' timmaġina xi sitwazzjoni li mbagħad tasal biex jiddispjaċiek minnha?

Probe to determine whether lack of concern about respondent's own posting is due to:

- i. respondent posting little information, or*
- ii. always thinking carefully before posting, or*
- iii. thinking that it is no problem that everybody has access to information about them*

If NOT i and ii then ask:

16.1 Tircievi tagħrif kummerċjali li taħseb li ġej minħabba xi tagħrif personali li int tajt? Jekk iva, kif tħossok dwar dan?

Probe to determine exactly:

- iv. if the respondents are aware of consequences of putting information online*
- v. why some are more acceptable than the others*
- vi. do people accept that receiving commercial info is part of the commercial trade-off for using the service*

16.2 X'taħseb jista' jiġri (b'hal per eżempju f'każ ta' għażla għal xi impjieg, jew reputazzjoni) b'riżultat tat-tagħrif personali li int tajt? Kif taħseb li dan jista' jiġri?

If Yes- **How do you think this will happen?**

If No- **Why don't you think this is possible?**

Probe to determine exactly how the respondents think about other people using their own information posted on UGCs. Use a neutral tone to allow both positive and negative reactions.

Running Total: 42 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

Usage of aliases/nicknames
[about 2 min]

If not previously established up to this point

Q.17 Qatt użajt isem ieħor, jew laqam, meta tajt tagħrif online? F'liema każ/każijiet, u għaliex? Jekk le, x'taħseb dwar dan?

Probe more in detail.

<p>- explore attitudes towards revealing personal information in different situations</p>	<p><i>Running Total: 44 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Attitudes towards use of personal information by websites [about 8 min]</p> <p><i>Show card B</i></p>	<p>Q.18 L-informazzjoni li min juża l-internet jagħti fl-account jew fil-profile ta' xi sit elettroniku tista' tintuża mis-sidien ta' dak is-sit għal hafna skopijiet, fosthom biex il-kontenut u r-reklamar jitfasslu skond il-preferenzi tal-klijenti li jużaw is-sit elettroniku, biex jintbagħtu messaġġi elettronici, biex tingabar informazzjoni personali dettaljata dwarhom, eċċ. Kont taf b'dan meta ffirmajt ma' sit elettroniku (jew UGC/SNS)? X'taħseb dwar dan?</p> <p><i>Make a note whether respondent was aware of purposes and probe to determine attitude to use of users' information for each of the following:</i></p> <p><i>Show card B:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>4. customize the advertising you see (show you only advertising for things/services that likely to interest you)</i> <i>5. share information (which could be linked to your name) about your behaviour with other parts of the company</i> <i>6. sell information (not linked to your name) about your behaviour to other companies</i> <p><i>For <u>each purpose</u> probe respondent for the reason behind finding the use acceptable/unacceptable.</i></p> <p><i>If not already mentioned, for any purpose respondent finds unacceptable ask:</i></p> <p>Q.19 Taht liema kundizzjonijiet, jekk hemm, jidhirlek li jkun aċċettabbli li min juża s-siti elettronici jagħtu tagħrif dwarhom infushom biex jintuża minn xi sit elettroniku (xi skop li l-intervistat iqis mhux aċċettabbli)?</p> <p><i>Probe to determine whether respondent would accept a ticket in a sweepstake/lottery, points on website such as Facebook points, a share of profits from the website, money.</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 52 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Attitudes towards & behaviour on privacy policies.</p>	<p>Q20 X'taħseb dwar policies ta' privatezza tal-UGCs/SNS li tuża int? Qrajthom qabel iffirmajt? Għal xiex tfittex? Jekk ma ssibx dak li kont qed tfittex, x'tagħmel?</p> <p><i>Probe to determine:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- if people really read the privacy policy;</i>

[about 4 min]	<p>- <i>what (presence/absence of some feature? reassurance?) they are looking for when they do read privacy policies; and</i></p> <p>- <i>what they do if what they are looking for isn't in the policy (carry on using the website anyway? not start/stop using it?)</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 56 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Thank & close</p>	<p>Dak kollu! Hemm xi ħaġa oħra li tixtieq iżżid?</p> <p><i>Hand out incentives if used</i></p> <p><i>Inform about the next steps, give more information about CONSENT project if respondent wishes</i></p> <p>Grazzi ħafna tal-kontribuzzjoni siewja tiegħek fil-proġett tagħna!</p> <p><i>Total: 60 min</i></p>

B. Pre-Analysis Template

Interview Country:	_____	Interviewer (name):	_____
Date:	_____	Interview number:	_____
Interviewee age:	_____	Gender:	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
			<input type="checkbox"/> Male
		Location:	<input type="checkbox"/> urban / suburban
			<input type="checkbox"/> rural
SNS/UGC usage:	<input type="checkbox"/> SNS/UGC user		
	<input type="checkbox"/> UGC (non-SNS) user		
	<input type="checkbox"/> SNS/UGC non-user		

Description of interview situation / overall impression:

Here, the idea of such general description is to provide a sense of how the interview went, and a general feeling of how the interviewee behaved during the interview. The interviewer (and/or the person transcribing the interview / filling out the template) is encouraged to reflect upon the general tone (e.g. relaxed, stiff), emotional expression (e.g. enthusiastic, reserved, interested, keen) and language use (e.g. formal/informal, precise, casual choice of words) of/by the interviewee as well as any specific content that is considered particularly important, e.g. highlighting contradictory statements, shifting perspectives and perceived ambivalences. Any quotes are particularly welcome!

A. Word Associations (Q1)

	Word Associations <i>(Please use single words or short phrases)</i>
Honesty	
Internet	
Work	
Family	
Privacy	

B. General Attitudes and Behaviour towards Disclosure of Personal Information

Willingness to give the following information:

To "Strangers"	Yes	No	Other <i>(please specify)</i>	Reasons
Marital Status (Q1.1)				
Income (Q1.2)				
ID Number (Q1.3)				

To Friends	Yes	No	Other <i>(please specify)</i>	Reasons
Marital Status (Q1.4)				
Income (Q1.4)				
ID Number (Q1.4)				

Additional Quotes:

C. Years of Internet Usage (Q2):

D. General Internet-related Attitudes

Positive Aspects of the Internet (“love most”) (Q3)	e.g. broadness of information, entertainment, worldwide networking, source of inspiration
Negative Aspects of the Internet (“dislike most”) (Q4)	e.g. misleading information, meaningless chatting, source of distraction, peer pressure to use SNS websites

Additional Quotes:

E. Commercial “Trade-Off’s” (Q5, Q5.i)

Information the interviewee would be willing to provide for a large discount on online purchases or services:

	Yes	No	Reasons
Phone Number			
Home Address			
Date of Birth			
Annual Income			
Marital Status			
Number of Kids			
Age of Kids			
ID / Passport Number			
Email address of partner/spouse			
Life Insurance Status			
Home Insurance Status			
Other			

Additional Quotes:

F. Everyday Internet Routines (Q6, Q7)

Frequency per day/week of

	Frequency	Potential Impact on lifestyle, habits, social relationships
Checking Emails		
Using Search Engines		
Using SNS websites (<i>which?</i>)		
Using other UGC websites (<i>which?</i>)		
Checking News		
Other (<i>please specify</i>)		

Additional Quotes:

G. SNS/UGC-related Perceptions, Attitudes and Behaviour

G.1 Interviewee holding / not holding accounts with one or more of the following sites (Q7, Q8, and Q11):

	Yes	No	Reasons for closing / not using the account anymore	Reasons for starting to use the account (Q11)
SNS websites (<i>e.g. Facebook, local SNS websites</i>)				
Business networking websites (<i>e.g. LinkedIn</i>)				
Dating websites (<i>e.g. parship.com</i>)				
Photo/video sharing websites (<i>e.g. Flickr,</i>				

<i>YouTube)</i>				
Websites providing reviews (<i>e.g. tripadvisor</i>)				
Micro blogging sites (<i>e.g. Twitter</i>)				
Wiki sites (<i>e.g. Wikipedia</i>)				
Multiplayer online games <i>e.g. World of Warcraft</i>)				

Additional Quotes:

G.2 Likelihood of SNS/UGC non-users to open an Account in the future (Q9)

	Likely	Not so likely	Reasons
SNS websites (<i>e.g. Facebook, local SNS websites</i>)			
Business networking websites (<i>e.g. LinkedIn</i>)			
Dating websites (<i>e.g. parship.com</i>)			
Photo/video sharing websites (<i>e.g. Flickr, YouTube</i>)			
Websites providing reviews (<i>e.g. tripadvisor</i>)			
Micro blogging sites (<i>e.g. Twitter</i>)			
Wiki sites (<i>e.g. Wikipedia</i>)			

Multiplayer online games <i>e.g. World of Warcraft</i>			

Additional Quotes:

G.3 Specific Privacy Concerns of SNS/UGC non-users (Q10)

Please quote the interviewees response to question 10; if she/he doesn't have any concerns regarding privacy in the context of opening/not opening or closing any SNS/UGC account, please indicate the reasons why (if given by the interviewee).

G.4 Personal Information Disclosure on UGC websites (Q12, Q13)

Name / Type of website		Type of information disclosed	Reasons for disclosure	Disclosure Strategies (<i>e.g. leaving questions blank, looking for similar websites that require less information</i>)
		Name		
		Home address		
		Photos of the interviewee		
		Photos of the interviewee's family & friends		
		Audio-video recordings		
		Medical information		
		Hobbies		
		Sports		
		Places where the interviewee has been		
		Tastes and opinions		
		Other		

Additional Quotes:

G.5 Privacy Settings (Q13)

Name / type of website	Form of setting <i>(e.g. stricter, less strict, limiting who can see personal information, (de-)activating newsletters / commercial offers, further usage of personal information provided)</i>	Motivation for this form of privacy setting
<i>(add lines if required)</i>		

Specific Quotes:

G.6 Consequences of Disclosing Personal Information (Q14, Q15, Q16, Q16.2)

	Situation where the disclosure of information was regretted	Consequences
Actual (own) experience		
Experiences of <u>others</u>		
Imagining <u>future</u> situations		

Specific Quotes:

G.6.1 Commercial Offers as a result of disclosing personal information (Q16.1)

Receiving commercial offers as a result of having disclosed personal information is		Reasons / Conditions
Acceptable		
Not acceptable		
Acceptable under conditions		

Specific Quotes:

G.7 Using an alias or a nickname (Q17)

		Reasons for/against using an alias or nickname
Yes		
No		

Specific Quotes:

G.8 Interviewee's Awareness of website owners using personal information for a number of purposes (Q18, Q19)

	Awareness		How did the interviewee learn about this	Attitude	Reaction / Resulting Behaviour
Customising the content and advertising users see	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Passing on personal information to third parties without permission	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Sending unwanted emails / newsletter	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Selling personal information to other companies	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Gather in-depth information about users	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				

Specific Quotes:

G.9 Privacy Policies (Q20)

G.9.1 Reading privacy policies

Reading privacy policies before signing up		Reasons
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly yes	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly not	

G.9.2 Content of privacy policies

Beliefs about privacy policies ("What do you think about privacy policies")	
Content expected to find ("What do you look for")	
Action taken if not found	
Other comments	

Specific Quotes:
